Ertel et al. S/N: 10/711,763

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-21 and 23-31 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed September 6, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 14, 16 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (USP 5,965,872) in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490). The Examiner next rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. and Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0181659). Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. and Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Jeromin et al. (USP 5,661,309). Claims 20-21 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick et al. (USP 5,796,109) in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Jeromin et al. Claims 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$103(a) as being unpatentable over Frederick et al. in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490), and further in view of Watanabe et al. (US Pub. 2002/0005490).

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 27 and 28 were allowed.

Claims 15 and 30-31 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Such indication is appreciated. Accordingly, claim 20 has been amended to incorporate claim 30, claim 30 has been canceled, and claim 31 has been amended to depend from claim 20.

New claim 32 has been added and incorporates the allowable subject matter of original claims 12 and 15.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. in view of Watanabe et al. Claim 12 has been amended and now calls for viscoelastic material secured externally to the housing and confined to respective identified prospective impact corners of a periphery of the housing. The amendment to claim 12 is supported at least by Fig. 6 of the application. Endo et al. is relied upon for allegedly teaching a housing that encloses a scintillator layer, an array of photosensitive detector elements, and a glass substrate. *Sept. 6, 2006, Office Action, Pg. 2.* Watanabe et al. was relied on for allegedly disclosing shock absorbers (38) inserted or arranged on the inner sides of the main body (31a). That which is now called for in claim 12 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 12, and the claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinct from the art of record.

Ertel et al. S/N: 10/711,763

Therefore, in light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-21 and 23-29, and 31-32.

Applicant has paid the fee of \$200.00 via EFS-web for one independent claim in excess of three. Applicant hereby authorizes charging of Deposit Account No. 07-0845 for any additional fees associated with entering the aforementioned claims.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Ziolkowski/

Timothy J. Ziolkowski Registration No. 38,368 Direct Dial 262-268-8181 tjz@zpspatents.com

Dated: December 6, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.239

P.O. ADDRESS:

Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC 136 South Wisconsin Street Port Washington, WI 53074 262-268-8100